Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In the treatment of the book of Esther, Siegfried mentions the effort of Lagarde and Zimmern to trace the story to a Persian or Babylonian origin. He finds even Zimmern's work incomplete, and turns to Jensen's identification of names, saying that "the combination of Esther with Ishtar, Marduk with Mordecai may be received as certain." He apparently follows Jensen in identifying Haman with Humman, the national deity of the Elamites. "Humman is the enemy of Marduk as Haman of Mordecai." The story of Haman's struggle with Mordecai has as its basis an old Babylonian history of the conquest of the Elamites by Babylon. The basis of the festival (Purim) is found in the Gilgamesh epic. Gilgamesh is supported in his heroic deeds by his wife (Kallatū=Hadassah). This wife and Ishtar blend into a single person, Hadassah-Esther. Siegfried admits that many things are left doubtful by this explanation of the source of the book, but holds, nevertheless, that the foundations of the Babylonian myth are clearly discernible, especially as many changes would be sure to occur in the transfer of the story to the Jews. In regard to the date of the book, the author notes that the writer was far removed from the Persian age; for he has only legendary notions of Ahasuerus and his reign. There is no sign of the religious revival of the early post-exilic days. The book is marked by national fanaticism, hatred of the heathen. The situation seems to be that which came in after the removal of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. Haman's murderous scheme is regarded as an exaggeration of the command of Antiochus, who ordered the execution of those who disobeyed the royal edict. While Siegfried holds, with all other scholars, that Esther was written to show the supposed origin of the Purim festival, it will be seen that his treatment of this book is much more radical than that of Ezra and Nehemiah. But he has clearly presented a view of the book which no scholar can disregard.

L. W. BATTEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE NEW SCHOLARSHIP. By JOHN P. PETERS. New York: Macmillan, 1901. Pp. xi + 328. $1.50.

THIS is one of the volumes of "The Churchman's Library," edited by J. H. Burn. The author endeavors to set before his readers: (1) "the fundamental problems involved in the acceptance of the Old Testament as Sacred Scripture;" (2) "the history of that thought-

development which has resulted in the modern methods of Bible study; or, how the application of the principles of evolution and comparison has affected our view of the history of the religion of Israel;" (3) "an illustration of modern methods of Bible study in general by a particular application in the case of one book — Psalms;" (4) "a survey of archæological discoveries bearing on the Old Testament."

The first part of the volume is divided into four heads: "The English Bible;" "The Bible, the Church, and Reason;" "The Incarnation and the Newer Criticism;" and "Our Lord's Treatment of the Old Testament." The themes, while fresh for the popular reader, seem to lack that unity which he looks for in such a work. Each theme, however, is handled with the freeness expected of one thoroughly familiar with his field of investigation. The Lord's treatment of the Old Testament receives largest attention. "He accepts the Old Testament spiritually and not literally." "The proof of the truth of any given passage is not its authorship nor its external claim to be the word of God, but itself" (p. 76). On that troublesome verse, Matt. 12:40, he says: "This verse . . . . is not to be taken as the words of our Lord, but as the explanatory comment of St. Matthew, who sees in the story of Jonah a sign of our Lord's resurrection. Use a modern device, bracket the verse, and the difficulty vanishes" (p. 67).

The part (II) dealing with "Evolution and the Bible" is the best-unified portion of the book. It sets forth quite clearly the newer results of the critical study of the Old Testament. Instead of "Jehovah" he usually adopts the form "Yahaweh," though we find both on the same page (128).

Part III, on "The Book of Psalms," does not entirely agree with the theory that David wrote no psalms. He maintains that "the evidence of tradition forces us to assign to David an important part in the development, not merely of secular, but also of religious, lyric poetry" (p. 175). Again he says, with eminent good sense: "The current method of criticism of the Psalter, which fails to recognize the older elements in the psalms because it dates them entirely by their latest elements only, is as unscientific as it would be to date every portion of the Hexateuch on the evidence of the latest additions to the priest code" (p. 177).

While he somewhat depreciates the full value attributed by other scholars to archæological results, his liberal references to the reversal of earlier current opinions regarding Greek, Roman, Indian, and

Persian history and literature, and his remarks on the tendency of Old Testament scholars to divide and subdivide, show that he appreciates the beginnings of what we may designate a reaction in Old Testament critical study.

IRA M. PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ÉTUDE SUR LES ORIGINES ET LA NATURE DU ZOHAR. Précédée d'une étude sur l'histoire de la Kabbale. Par S. KARPPE. Paris: Alcan, 1901. Pp. x + 604. Fr. 7.50.

A STUDY of Jewish mysticism along critical and scientific lines, as may be expected, dates from the nineteenth century. It is sufficient to mention the works of Franck, *La Kabbale*, 1843; Joel, *Die Religionsphilosophie des Sohar*, 1849; Landauer, posthumous articles in *Litteraturblatt des Orients*, 1845; Jellinek, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Kabbala*, 1852; Stern, "Versuch einer umständlichen Analyse des Sohar," in *Ben-Chananja*, 1858–60; Grätz, principally notes 3 and 12 in the seventh volume of his *Geschichte der Juden*, 1873. The net result of those investigations was a more or less clear presentation of the "zoharitic system" and the fastening of the authorship of the Zohar, the Bible of Kabbalism, upon Moses de Leon, who lived in the second half of the thirteenth century. It was furthermore the merit of Grätz to give emphasis to Landauer's important discrimination between the Kabbalah proper and the older mysticism of gaonaic times. Jellinek was well on the road toward giving a synthetic, truly historical view of the rise of the Kabbalah out of the mysticism that preceded it. To present this view in full is the aim of Karppe's work. The author has used to good purpose the *Vorarbeiten* mentioned above. He might also have referred in the chapter dealing with gaonaic mysticism to Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (chap. 9, "Geheimlehre"), 1832 (second edition, 1892), and in that portion of his book in which he compares Philo and the Zohar (especially with regard to the allegorical method of interpretation) to Siegfried's *Philo von Alexandria*, 1875.

Jewish mysticism is older than the canon. It is found imbedded in its third section. Its origins may be sought in that vast store of mythology that came to Palestine from Babylon. Persia contributed its share. A fresh impetus came from Greece. It meant a reaction against Jewish orthodoxy with the Law as the canon *par excellence* and